



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE THREE SINS OF THE HERMIT

The antecedents and congeners in folk-story of the tale which Matthew Gregory Lewis enlarged and adapted in his Gothic romance, *The Monk*, are of the greatest interest. It is possible to trace them in Persian, Arabic, and Turkish literature, in the popular traditions of races dependent on these nations for their culture, in medieval illustrative tales employed in sermons and in the later jest-books, and finally in modern European literature and tradition. The present article purposes to survey this history briefly with the publication of a number of hitherto unprinted versions.¹

The story is of course a familiar one. It relates how a man proud of his virtue elects to commit the least of three sins, drunkenness, adultery, and murder, and before his intoxication is finished he has committed the other two sins. The earliest form of the story is pretty certainly oriental, although it is not easy to identify. The rather numerous Eastern parallels fall readily into two easily separable groups: those in which there are two actors, the fallen angels Hārūt and Mārūt, and those in which there is but a single hero, often named the anchorite Baršīšā.

The story of the angels Hārūt and Mārūt, which has been recently examined critically by Enno Littmann,² is related as a gloss on

¹ The studies devoted to this story are numerous and important: A. d'Ancona, *Poemetti popolari italiani*, pp. 14 ff.; B. Heller, "Die Legende von den drei Sünden des Einsiedlers und vom Mönch Baršīšā," *Ungarische Rundschau*, I (1912), 653-73; K. Kümmell, *Drei italienische Prosalegenden*, Diss., Halle, 1906, pp. 25-42; *Keleti Tanulmányok Goldziher Ignác születésének 60 évfordulójára írták tanítványai*, Budapest, 1910, pp. 204 ff. (where, says Frenken [*Jaques de Vitry*, p. 111], "die ganze bisherige Literatur zitiert ist"); Łopacinski, "Legiendy o pustelniku," *Wiśła*, XI (1898), 448-51. J. Bolte has collected many references to the employment of the theme; see his *Martin Montanus*, pp. 583, 657; *Wickrams Rollwagenbüchlein*, p. 383, and *Wickrams Werke*, VIII, 346; and further see Chauvin, *Bibliog.*, VIII, 128, 131. Unfortunately I have been unable to obtain a copy of the volume dedicated to Goldziher. For substantial assistance I am indebted to Mr. Gordon W. Thayer, librarian in charge of the John G. White Collection of the Cleveland Public Library. The references to this story are very confusing, for it has often been considered a variant of the legends of St. John Paulu(s), St. John Chrysostom, or of the vernacular legend of St. Albano (which is to be distinguished from the legends of the various Saints Albanus).

² "Hārūt und Mārūt," *Festschrift für Friedrich Carl Andreas*, Leipzig, 1916, pp. 70-87. See also Grünbaum, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprach- und Sagenkunde*, Berlin, pp. 58 ff. (reprinted from *Zs. d. d. morgenl. Ges.*, XXXI), 192, 442 ff. (reprinted from *ibid.*, XLII). Grünbaum comments (p. 445) on the peculiar twist given to the story by making the girl the seducer and not the seduced, but this is a variation which seriously weakens its effectiveness. For further references see Chauvin, *Bibliographie*, VIII, No. 123, 131; L. Montagne, *Les légendes de la Perse*, Paris, 1890, pp. 1-59; A. Certeux and H. Carnoy, *L'Algérie traditionnelle*, Paris, 1884, pp. 22-28.

Surah 2:96 of the Koran: "And they followed that which the demons taught against Solomon's rule, not that Solomon was unbelieving, rather the demons were unbelieving, since they taught sorcery, and what had been revealed to the two angels in Babil, Hārūt and Mārūt." From the commentary of Tabari (d. A.D. 923), the *Tafsīr*, Littmann extracts no less than nine versions of the story, and to this collection further additions could no doubt be made. A typical version is the following, which Littmann took down in Persian from dictation and translated into German:

There were two angels, Hārūt and Mārūt, who came before the throne of the exalted ruler with the request, "O Creator of Heaven and Earth, you have elevated the children of men by the office of vice-regency¹ and sent them into the world. But they did not perform their duty in vice-regency, for they have acted against your command and have been lacking in praise and recognition of you. If you had sent us, who are angels, we would have executed your commandments and have shown piety and fear of God." When God the Almighty and Exalted heard their speech, he commanded that they should go in human form to the earth and live among men as men, with this difference that they by uttering the greatest name could rise to heaven and descend thence; but it was forbidden to them to break the command of God and teach men the greatest name, which is a secret of divinity. The two angels cast themselves down in adoration and said in humility, "O Lord of the Worlds, from the beginning of the world to this time we have never done an act against the divine command. How could it be possible that we like men should commit unheard of sin or by the disclosing of the secret of divinity should become an object of the anger of the greatest creator?" Finally they were sent in human form into this world and they resided in the city Babil. After a time, when they had become acquainted with the customs of the world, they forgot, in their devotion to worldly enjoyments, to praise and acknowledge God, and they were seized with love for two comely maidens, Zuhra and Muštari, who possessed the most finished skill in the arts of song and dance. These two maidens, who were endowed at the same time with wisdom and understanding, noticed that Hārūt and Mārūt had power in magic and sorcery and over supernatural things, since they flew to heaven and returned again. Now they wished to learn the hidden secret by a trick; since they could not arrive at their end in any other way, they promised their favors to the angels. But the draught of union in love and joy they would only prepare with the liquor of the grape. Finally, thirsty for love, the angels tasted the bitter wine and drank cup after cup. When drunkenness won the upper hand and

¹ Koran, 2, 28; 38, 25.

the garment of understanding escaped from their hands, then the maidens seized the opportunity and acquired the secret. By pronouncing the greatest name they flew to heaven and gained the dignity of lucky stars. Hārūt and Mārūt were placed as a punishment in a well at Babil and will remain there until the day of judgment.

In some versions the maidens instead of becoming stars are killed by the angels and this is probably nearer the original form of the story. Littmann makes the following comments on the expanded version he prints: (1) Although the notion of angel-marriage is Hebraic (cf. Gen. 6:1), the story is not Hebraic in origin, for the names Hārūt and Mārūt are Iranian. The conclusion from this is that an originally Persian story came into contact with Hebrew theology in Babylon while on its way to Arabia. (2) The figure of Zuhra is foreign to the story and is presumably a Babylonian addition. Zuhra, the name of the star of the goddess of love, corresponds in a general way to Venus. The incident of the love of Zuhra and a hero suggests comparison with the Gilgamesh epic. (3) In a few versions a companion to Zuhra, named Muštari, is added to complete the symmetry of the story by providing two seducers for the two angels, and because modern Persian (and not Arabic) is a language in which both Zuhra and Muštari could, without violating the rules of gender as determined by terminations, be personified as women, the incident in which Muštari appears must be of modern Persian origin.¹ (4) The motif of the "greatest name" is a commonplace in oriental story and is the latest accretion. Although the chief problems in the Hārūt-Mārūt legend have been only grazed, they need not concern us greatly, for the legend is clearly composed of many once independent episodes which have little or nothing to do with the tale in hand.

Interesting as the legend of Hārūt and Mārūt is, there is another tale which concerns us more nearly, a legend which has been called the "Faust of the Orient."² This version—or rather group of

¹ But compare Grünbaum, p. 446.

² G. Heinrich, "Faust az őkurban [Faust in antiquity]," *Budapesti Szemle*, CXXXVIII (1909), 365. Cited by B. Heller, *Ung. Rundsch.*, I, 654. Unfortunately I have not seen this article. On Baršišā, see further I. Goldziher and C. Graf v. Landberg-Hallberger, *Die Legende vom Mönch Baršišā*, Kirchhain (N.L.), 1896; M. Hartmann, "Der heilige Baršišā," *Der islamische Orient, Berichte und Forschungen*, I (Berlin, 1899), 23–48. B. Heller (p. 658) points out a striking analogue to this story in early Christian hagiology: the legend of St. James of Palestine (*AA. SS.*, [January 28], 868–73). The resemblance, however, turns on the murder of a girl brought to the saint for cure, an essential element in the Baršišā legend, one which has no immediate connection with the *exemplum* of the three sins.

versions—is widely current in countries under the influence of Islam, and strikingly enough its distribution complements that of the Hārūt-Mārūt type. The former is known in Tunis, Syria, Turkey, and Arabia, later in a form very similar to the *exemplum* of the three sins among the Suaheli and in Zanzibar, while the latter, as we have seen, is told most often in Persia and Hindustan, although it has been once taken down in Algeria. This story with a single hero—or villain—is usually attached to the name of the anchorite Barṣiṣā. The form of the name suggests a Syriac origin or Syriac associations. Abū-l-Lejt al Samarqandī (d. *ca.* 1000) is the first to tell the story in connection with Barṣiṣā.

Iblis took counsel with his subordinates about the possibility of seducing a pious servant of God, by name Barṣiṣā, in whose prayers curative powers inhered. One demon believed himself equal to the task. He confused the senses of the king's daughter and then—in human form—suggested to her attendants that she be sent to the anchorite. He cured her and returned her to the court. The demon again deranged her mind and counselled leaving her for some days with Barṣiṣā. The holy man assented with some misgivings. So long as he prayed and fasted he was able to resist the temptation, but when he relaxed the severity of his self-mortification he fell. The demon awoke in him fear of the king, with the result that he killed the girl. The demon accused him in court and the anchorite's crime was revealed. The murderer was crucified. On the cross the demon offered to save him if he would do homage to the powers of evil, and Barṣiṣā bowed his head before the demon, who laughed and left him to his misfortune.

In 1326 the traveler Ibn Batuta saw not far from Tunis the cell of the sinner, and his mention of the spot betokens familiarity with the story.¹ For a version of great importance in later literary history we may turn to the Turkish *Forty Veziers*, a collection of tales which may be dated in the fifteenth century.

The devotee Barṣiṣā, who had worshipped for a hundred years in his cell, had acquired thereby an enviable reputation as a holy man capable of curing the sick by his touch or his breath. When the king's daughter fell ill and the court physicians were unable to help her, the king sent her to Barṣiṣā. The recluse, seeing her beauty, was tempted and ordered the eunuchs to leave the girls with him. No sooner, however, was his passion fulfilled than he regretted his act. Satan counselled him to kill her and tell the eunuchs in the morning that she had been cured and had left during

¹ C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti, *Voyages asiatiques d'Ibn Batoutah*, I (Paris, 1874), 26.

the night. Then in the form of an old man Satan appeared to the eunuchs and disclosed where the body had been buried. Barşışâ was haled before the king and condemned to death. He was about to be executed when Satan appeared to him, saying that if the anchorite would bow down in adoration before the Devil, he would be saved from death. When Barşışâ adored Satan the Evil One spat in his face and vanished.

It is this form of the story, chiefly distinguished by the concluding episode in which the Devil mocks the sinner, that has become the accepted literary form of the story. Inasmuch as the facts about it have been examined more than once, I may be brief. The Turkish story in the *Forty Veziers* was taken into Petis de la Croix's *Mille et un jours* (1710), and thence it passed into the *Guardian* (August 31, 1713, No. 148). To the English translation Matthew Gregory Lewis was, as he acknowledges in a prefatory note, indebted for the main theme of his novel, *The Monk* (1795). Into the history of the influence of *The Monk* it is hardly necessary to go at length.¹ One may note the existence of a German adaptation of the third or fourth rate, *Die blutende Gestalt mit Dolch und Lampe oder die Beschwörung im Schloss Stern bei Prag* (1816), about which there has been some discussion concluding with the result that the German tale is merely a re-working of Lewis' novel and not its source.² But of greater significance than this is the fact E. T. A. Hoffmann was stimulated in the composition of *Die Elixiere des Teufels* (1816) by his acquaintance with the English novel. Here the story, now far removed from the simple legend of Barşışâ, has become literature.³

Other witnesses than the *Forty Veziers* to the popularity of the story in Turkish sources are the poets Fusuli (d. 1562) and Ruhi III (d. 1605). Fusuli, who is famed for his poem "Beng and Bode," a disputation between hasheesh and wine, has Beng (hasheesh) relate "the story of a pious man, who, after he had given himself up to the

¹ See Baldensperger, "Le Moine de Lewis dans la Littérature Française," *Journal of Comparative Lit.*, I (1903), 201-19. On the sources of *The Monk* see R. Fürst, *Die Vorläufer der modernen Novelle*, Halle, 1897, p. 49; M. Rentsch, *Matthew Gregory Lewis, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Romans "Ambrosio or the Monk,"* Diss., Leipzig, 1902; M. P. Conant, *The Oriental Tale in England*, 1908, pp. 27 ff.

² See Ritter, *Arch. f. d. Stud. d. neu. Spr.*, CXI (1903), 106-21; Herzfeld, *ibid.*, 316-23; Ritter, *ibid.*, CXIII (1904), 56-65.

³ Cf. W. Harich, *E. T. A. Hoffmann*, I (Berlin, 1920), 267-90. On Hoffmann in turn depends Calé's *Franziskus*, for which Harich has the highest praise.

use of wine, became thoroughly bad.”¹ In connection with Ruhi III von Hammer-Purgstall terms the story one of the most threadbare of Moslem legend. The poet says that one Sanaan by his pride in his virtue gave Satan the opportunity of seducing him to wine-drinking, adultery, and murder.²

Furthermore, the story has preserved itself to the present day in Africa and Zanzibar. The Suaheli, who tell it without reference to the name of the once saintly Barşîşâ, preserve more distinctly the sequence of drunkenness, adultery, and murder.

The younger of two devils declared to the elder one that he could seduce a teacher whose sole occupation was praying. He selected a young girl and placed her in a house adjoining the teacher's. On the morrow he asked the teacher to visit the girl who was feigning sickness. She gave him intoxicating drinks, and in the course of four months the girl was aware of a change in her condition. Fearing discovery, the teacher killed her. “The end of it all was, therefore, that the two were numbered among the evil spirits.”³

Farther south the Arabic-speaking population tell a similar story to demonstrate that wine is the root of all evil:

A judge visited a woman who had been inspired by the Devil. She locked the doors, forbidding him to leave until he had either killed a little girl, drunk wine, or committed adultery with her. Electing what he considered the least of the three crimes, he drank the glass of wine, whereupon the other sins followed.⁴

Our story also made its way to the Hebrews, who modified it in a characteristic way by introducing into it the sin of eating pork. The story's tone smacks of the scribe and the quibbling doctor of the law:

An infidel king invited eleven doctors to dinner and then proposed to them that they should either eat pork, have commerce with heathen women, or drink wine consecrated to idols. After some debate they agreed that the last-named sin was the least, for it was forbidden not by the Law but by man. When they had drunk of the wine they failed to notice that the table before them turned on a pivot and they, eating indiscriminately, consumed pork as

¹ Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst*, II (Pesth, 1837), 299. See also a variant cited in Fleischer's *Cat. of Or. MSS in Dresden*, No. 362 (A.D. 1599).

² *Ibid.*, III, 136, n. 1.

³ C. Velten, *Märchen und Erzählungen der Suaheli*, Stuttgart, 1898, pp. 47-48, “Der fromme Lehrer.”

⁴ C. Reinhardt, *Ein arabischer Dialekt gesprochen in Oman und Zanzibar* (Lehrb. d. Sem. f. orient. Spr., 13), Stuttgart, 1894, pp. 392-94, “Die Folgen des Weingenusses.”

well as permitted foods. When they went to bed the heat of the wine and the meat cause them to sin once more. On awakening they were apprized of their crimes, which were soon expiated, inasmuch as all of them died within the year.¹

A form closely related to this Hebrew tale made its way into Europe, where, adapted to Saladin, it was told in France by Etienne de Bourbon. His version, brief and pointless as it is, fell on stony soil. Its existence is evidence of the story's having been carried from the East to Europe, but no further significance attaches to Etienne's version, which was copied, so far as I know, only in the *Speculum morale*. Etienne tells it as follows:

Item exempla Sarracenorum, qui abstinere ad preceptum Mahometi, nisi in quibusdam festivitatibus suis, in quibus pre ebrietate insaniunt. Audivi quod quidam monachi, venientes ad Saladinum, inceperunt eum monere ad conversionem. Ille autem quesivit de religione eorum, de victu et abstinentia, et si abstinerent a carnibus et a mulieribus et a vino; qui dixerunt [quod] a carnibus et mulieribus abstinebant, a vino non. Qui recepit eos honorifice, et fecit parari delicata secundum morem eorum, sine vino; et, cum dormirent, misit eis mulieres ad sollicitandum eos. Ipsi autem eas a se viriliter abegerunt. Post aliquantum temporis, cum abstinuissent a vino, fecit eis parari minus delicate; tamen vinum fecit eis propinari fortissimum. Illi autem, quia a vino diu abstinerant, avidius biberunt, non temperantes vinum ut oportuisset, nec temperaverunt se a vino; sed, cum essent inebriati et quasi consopiti, misit ad eos mulieres dictas, in quibus sollicitantibus incurrerunt absorpti vino: unde dictus Sarracenus confutavit eos.²

The question which now confronts us, that of the dissemination of the story in Europe, is rather difficult, for at a comparatively early time the tale appears in a number of widely differing forms. One we have already met in the *Liber de Septem Donis* of Etienne de Bourbon, and another and more important instance is of course the

¹ Dorville, "Deux légendes rabbiniques," *La Tradition*, II (1888), 273 ff. (from *Hist. des diff. peupl. du monde*, III [1771], 381-83). The same story may be found in Grünbaum, *Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie*, 1882, p. 450; see R. Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften*, I, 583.

² Lecoy de la Marche, *Ancedotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Etienne de Bourbon*, Paris, 1877, 414, No. 481; reprinted, according to Wesselski, in *Speculum morale*, 3, 8, 2, 1358 B (ed. Bibliotheca mundi, Douay, 1624); translated in Wesselski, *Mönchsleben*, 1909, pp. 22-23, No. 17. His parallel (pp. 204-5) from the *Apologie pour Hérodote* does not seem apposite. It may be compared with the incident in Saadi's *Gulistan* (II, 29; tr. Gaudin, in *Mille et un jours*, 1840, p. 579; cf. d'Ancona, *Poemeti pop. it.*, pp. 3-4), which Dunlop (*Gesch. d. Prosadicht.*, 1851, pp. 414, 524) considered the oriental analogue of our story. Liebrecht remarks that the resemblance is only in a general trait; cf. Kümmell, p. 26.

previously mentioned legend of the anchorite Barșîșă which did not reach Europe until about 1700. The difficulty of showing the line of descent is enhanced by the fact that the citations of the story do not always indicate satisfactorily exactly what one of various rather similar tales is referred to.¹ I shall keep rather strictly to the history of one tale: the three sins of the hermit. Other narratives will from time to time obtrude themselves on our attention, but they will be disposed of as briefly as possible.

A story in the Old French *Vie des anciens pères*—which differs considerably in its contents from the *Vitas Patrum*—may serve as a starting-point: “De l’ermite qui s’enyvra ou d’un ermite qui tua son compère et jut à sa commère.” The substance of this tale, which has been termed “Ivresse,” is as follows:

The Devil had tormented a hermit for a long time and finally agreed to desist if the hermit would commit one of three sins. The hermit elected drunkenness as the least and as one that could be atoned for. When the hermit was invited to dinner by his neighbor the miller, he made up his mind to fulfil his obligation to the Devil on this occasion. He became so drunk that the miller’s wife accompanied him to his cell. On the way thither the hermit attacked her and when her husband rushed up to defend her, killed him. Then, realizing the craft of the Devil, the hermit journeyed to Rome, where the Pope laid a severe penance upon him. Finally the hermit entered the joys of Paradise.²

An early derivative of this story is an allusion in the *Libro de Apolonio*, one of the first compositions in the vernacular. The narrative is so brief that one cannot be certain of all the events:

De hun ermitanyo santo oyemos retrayer,
 Porque fiço el pecado el vino beuer,
 Quo en adulterio por ello a cayer,
 Despues en adulterios las manos a meter.³

¹ Kümmell’s dissertation gives the best survey of the different types of stories that have been mentioned in connection with the one discussed. I draw attention only to the legend of St. Hilarius as narrated in the fifteenth-century *Selentroist* (*Die deutschen Mundarten*, ed. Frommann, I [1854], 208, No. 39) which is apparently an effort to turn our story into one with a happy ending. It seems to have enjoyed no wide currency. Briefly it is as follows: The Devil persuaded Hilarius to put wine in his drinking water, then to drink wine undiluted, then to eat meat, and finally he tempted him with a woman, but at this point St. Martin intervened.

² Méon, *Nouveau recueil*, II, 173 ff.; *Vie des anciens pères*, No. 35, “Ivresse”; it is reprinted, says Kümmell (p. 38), in Roquefort, *De l’état de la poésie française*, Paris, 1821, pp. 334 ff. For the literature on the *Vie des anciens pères* see Gröber, *Grundriss*, II, 1, 914.

³ Str. 55 (*Bibl. de Aut. Esp.*, 57, 285); ed. Marden, I, 7.

Based immediately on the text printed by Méon is an unedited prose tale in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale, "De Mathelin l'ermite et du musnier son compère," which adds proper names to the narrative in the *Vie des anciens pères* and abbreviates its descriptive passages.¹ From the same source the story passes into the main current of *exemplum* literature and thence into the stream of the later jest-books. Vossler (p. 35) draws attention to an illustrative story found in the *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry* (chap. 89, "De abstinence"): "un hermite qui eslut celui pechié de gloutonie, et le fist et s'enyvra, et par celui il cheist en tous les VII pechez mortelz, et avoit cuidié eslire le plus petit des VII."² This, it is said, was told at length in the lost first book of the *Livre*. The change from three sins to seven is to be explained, with Vossler, as a slip of memory remedied by the insertion of a new number suggested by the familiar seven deadly sins. From the *Vie des anciens pères* the story also comes down to the compiler of a German handbook of *exempla*, as follows:

S. Hieronymus sagt/ Ich wil michs nicht vberreden lassen/ das ein trunckener Mensch könne züchtig vnd keusch sein. Drumb merck.

Ein frommer Man ward vom Teuffel hart angefochten/ das er vnter dreyen Sünden eine verbringen solte/ entweder sich einmal voll sauffen oder sein Nachbarn beim Weibe schlaffen/ oder seinen Nachbarn erwürgen. Als er sich nun wider solche anfechtunge lange auffhielte/ vnd der Teuffel jm keinen frieden liesse/hat er gewilliget/ sich einmal voll zusauffen/ Denn er meinete/ solchs were nicht so eine grosse Sünde/ als die andern zwo. Als er aber solches gethan/ da findet sich der Hurenteuffel/ vnd bildet jme des Nachbars Weib für/ wie sie schön vnd freundlich sey. Darumb findet er sich als balde zu jhr/ vberredet sie/ vnd schleift bey jhr. In des kompt jr Man/ der Nachbar/ zumassen/ vnd wils rechen/ Aber dieser stellet sich zur wehre/ vnnd erwürgt seinen Nachbarn/ begieng also alle drey Sünden/ eben auff eine zeit. Im Sauffteuffel.³

¹ Vossler, "Zu den Anfängen der französischen Novelle," *St. z. vgl. Lit. gesch.*, II, (1902), 29, No. 25. See below, p. 94, n. 3.

² See Montaignon, p. 175; in the English translation (ed. T. Wright, E.E.T.S., 1868), p. 116.

³ Hondorf, *Promptuarium exemplorum*, fol. 229 (as cited by Bolte). The text above was very kindly copied by Professor George L. Hamilton from the edition of 1680, "Nun aber mit vielen Historien vermehrt und in eine newe richtige Ordnung bracht. Auch mit schönen Figuren gezieret Durch Vincentium Sturmium," fol. 325, verso, under the "Exempel des Sechsten Gebots." It is also found in *Jocoseria, Das ist Schimpff vnd Ernst*, Lich, 1605, Teil 2, Nr. 101. There is a Low German translation in *Leienbibel In hundert Fragen*. . . . Dorch Nicolavm Grysen, Rostock, 1604, 2, fol. Rja, No. 42.

The actual text of Hondorf's immediate source, the *Sauß Teuffel*, is also before me, and since it is somewhat longer and more elaborate than the extract I print it:

Ich wil eins [Exempel] erzehlen: Man liset davon/ dass der Teuffel eins mals einen Menschen tag vnd nacht kein ruw lassen wöllen/ Und da er jhn gefragt/ was er darf von jhm beger/ Sol er geantwortet haben: Er wölle jm keine ruw lassen/ er bewillige deñ vnter dreyen Sünden eine zubegehen. Fragt er: Was es denn für Sünden weren? Da antwortet er: Er solte entweder seinem Nachbawrn bey dem Weib schlaffen/oder solte jhn/den Nachbawren erwürgen/ Oder wo er der eins nicht [226^a] thum wolte/ solt er jhm sich zu gefallen ein mal voll sauffen. Da hab er keins willigen wöllen. Als aber der Teuffel jhm gar keine ruhe lassen wil/ williget er endlich sich ein mal voll zu sauffen/ Als dass es nicht so ein grosse Sünde war (wie er meynte) als die andern zwo.

Da er sich nun vollgesoffen/ vnnd seiner Vernunft gleich beraubt war/ Bald sind der Hurenteuffel vnnd der Mordteuffel vorfunden/ vnnd legen Hannd zu werck/ betriegen den armē Menschen/ geben jm ein/ dass jm eynfelt in trunckener weiss/ vnd gedenckt: Sihe da/ was hast du gethan? Du hast dich dem Teuffel zu gefallen vollgesoffen/ was hastu nu davon? Du hattest gleich so mehr gewilliget bey dess Nachbawrn Weib zu schlaffen/ so hettest du doch freud vnd lust davon gehabt/ Ich habs doch schon zu viel gewagt/ vnd dem Teuffel zu gefallen mich vollgesoffen/ damit wider Gott gesündiget/ Sol ich nun von Gott gestrafft werden/ so verdiene ichs eben so mehr wol.

In dess mahlet jhm der Hurenteuffel in trunckener weiss des Nachbawren Weib für/ wie sie so schön/ so freundtlich sey/ darauff geht er also truncken hin/ vberredt sie/ vnd schläfft bey jhr. In dess kompt jhr Mann/ der Nachbawr/ zu massen/ vnnd wils rechnen/ Aber dieser stellt sich zur wehr/ vnd erwürgt seinen Nachbawrn. Beding also drey Sünden auff ein zeit.

Sihe da/ ist das nicht ein recht Exempel? Dabey man sihet/ wie die Teuffel ein gewonnen spiel haben/ weñ sich ein Mensch den Saufteuffel nerren vnnd betriegen lässt. Der Hurenteuffel vnnd Mordteuffel kundten bey disem Menschē nichts aussrichten/ der Saufteuffel bringets meisterlich zu wegen/ damit dass er dem armē Menschen eyngibt/ vollsauffen sey nicht so grosse Sünde als andere/ verkleinert also solch Laster/ wie er leyder jetzund bey vielē thut/ dass es viel für kein Laster noch Sünde/ sondern für eitel Tugend halten.¹

¹ Matth. Friderich, *Wider den Sauß Teuffel*, gebessert u. an vielen örtern gemehret in *Theatrum diabolorum*, Teil 1, fol. 225 ff., Franckfurt am Mayn: P. Schmid, 1587. For the copying of the text from this scarce volume I am indebted to Professor Hugo Hepding, of Giessen.

It appears in that thesaurus of jests, Johannes Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*, which was written in Alsace in 1519 and published in 1522.¹ Hans Sachs found it there and turned it into a Meister-gesang (1554), assigning as his source "Rupertus."² Martin Montanus of Strassburg, who is unfavorably distinguished among the none too fastidious sixteenth-century collectors of jests for his delight in the obscene and offensive, took it from Pauli with some alterations as an illustrative tale in his *Andreützo* (1557).³ I shall not now develop the history of the tale in the hands of the contemporary writers of jest-books inasmuch as they derived their knowledge of the story from other sources, but shall return to them later.

The story appears in a variety of medieval collections of *exempla*, for which I refer in general to Herbert's monumental *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, Vol. III. It is quite clear that at least one new and quite independent tradition is represented in the tales which I am about to cite. Among other interesting things regarding the tale's diffusion in the Middle Ages is the fact that it is depicted in a series of miniatures in a manuscript in the British Museum.⁴ The oldest text of the *exemplum* in the manuscripts of the Museum appears to be that in the *Speculum Laicorum*, which was composed "after (and probably not very long after) the death of Henry III in 1272."⁵ The text of this version is as follows:

Quidam quesivit a vicino suo quod si oporteret eum peccatum mortale committere quod cicius eli [*sic*] eligeret respondit inebriari reputans illud aliis minus cumque inebriatus esset die vno quod domum duam adire nesciret traditit ei quidam vicinus suus filiam suam ut eum duceret ad domum suam cumque fuissent in via. defloravit eam et cum quidam superueniret surgens occidit eum. Ecce vnum elegit et tria commisit scilicet adulterium homicidium et ebrietatem.

It may also be found in a collection of 315 edifying tales compiled in England in the second half of the thirteenth century.⁶ This text,

¹ Ed. Oesterley (Stutt. Lit. Ver., 85), 1866, No. 243, p. 161; cf. notes, p. 501. It should be observed that the editions of the *Schimpf und Ernst* from 1560 on have another version of the story taken from the *Rollwagenbüchlein*.

² Ed. Goetze and Drescher (*Neudrucke*, 231-35), VI, 112-14, No. 908; ed. Keller and Goetze, XXV, 450, No. 4378.

³ Ed. Bolte (Stutt. Lit. Ver., 217), 1899, p. 167; cf. pp. 583, 657.

⁴ Roy. 10. E. iv, ff. 113b-18b; cf. Herbert, III, 131.

⁵ Herbert, III, 385, No. 206 (Add. 11284).

⁶ Herbert, III, 500, No. 279 (Roy. 7. D. 1).

thinks Mr. Herbert, may have been copied from the *Speculum Laicorum*; but it differs so markedly from the version just given that I am inclined to believe there must have been some intermediate, possibly oral forms. The text follows for comparison:

Narratur de quodam sacerdote mangni nominis quod cum multis temptationibus impungnaretur audiuit sibi uocem dicentem. Elige tibi de tribus quod uolueris quia contingit tibi incidere aut in ebrietatem aut in fornicacionem aut in homicidium. Qui excogitans putans se minus ex tribus peccatis peccatum eligere elegit ebrietatem. Post hoc contigit eum ad domum uicini sui diuertere. ibique inebriatus est qui cum esset in camera solus et quedam muliercula uel forte pararet lectum eius uel consilium anime petetet ab eo cum ea fornicatus est. Quo facto timmens confusionem hominum si peccatum suum per mulierem publicaretur interfecit eam. Et sic per ebrietatem etiam fornicacionem et homicidium perpetravit.

For a transcript from another smaller collection of tales¹ I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Charles A. Williams, of the University of Illinois. This is, according to the description in Herbert's *Catalogue*, the same story as the one with which we have been dealing; but the text does not bear this out. The *exemplum* bears the title "De penitencia" and is as follows:

De heremita uolente scire quid esset peccatum. qui passus est lubricum carnis et interfecit uirum mulieris et ad mentem reuersus ait se non iturum nisi manibus et pedibus donec sciret peccatum sibi dimissum. et transactis pluribus annis inuentus a unenatoribus in nemore. regi est presentatus et dum puer ab ipso baptizaretur. clamauit. dimissum est tibi peccatum tuum. et culpam suam coram omnibus recognoscans [*sic*] erectus super pedes abiit.

This is obviously something entirely different from the stories we have been considering, for the whole trend of the narrative is altered. We hear nothing of wine as the cause of the crimes of adultery and murder, curiosity alone is the impelling force. New also is the allusion to the "venatoribus in nemore," and more striking still are the oath "se non iturum nisi manibus et pedibus" and the sentence "erectus super pedes abiit." The *exemplum* before us has taken many traits from the legend of St. John Chrysostom, who ran about as a beast of the forest in penance for his sins. Indeed it is probably no more than a condensation of the saint's legend with the omission

¹ Add. 27909 B; cf. Herbert, III, 465, No. 23.

of his name. The variations which have been noted are sufficient to show that this story belongs in another line of descent and that, although it exhibits some superficial resemblances to the tale under consideration, it is not to be classed as a version thereof.

Next chronologically of the occurrences of the *exemplum* in the manuscripts of the British Museum seems to be its employment in the *Convertimini*, a didactic work ascribed to Richard Holcot (d. 1349). This instance appears to be an interpolation in a single manuscript, for it is found in but one of the many texts of the *Convertimini*.¹ The source, moreover, of the interpolation is reasonably certain inasmuch as the *Convertimini* version seems to be a condensation of the *exemplum* in Royal 7. D. I above. It is as follows:

Narratur de quodam sacerdote magni nominis cum multis temptacionibus inpu gnaretur audiuit uocem dicentem sibi elige tibi de tribus diebus quam uolueris quia contiget [*sic*] tibi incidere aut in ebrietatem aut in fornicationem aut in homicidium qui ex cogitans quod minus omnium cum esset ebrietas preelegit eam postea contigit eum ad domum cuiusdam amici diuertere ubi inebriatus est qui cum esset in camera solus et quedam mulier intraret ut paret sibi lectum cum ea fornicatus est quo factor timens confusionem hominum si per mulierum factum publicaretur eam interficeret [*sic*] per solam tria plagissima perpetrans.

The fourteenth-century miscellany of tales in Harley 268 also has the story.² The text, which I am able to print by virtue of Professor Williams' courtesy, is obviously a somewhat more elaborate version of the legend in Add. 27909 B, which has just been given.

Ex[emplum] de quodam hermita.

Quidam hermita uolens seire quid esset peccatum quamdam mulierem concupiuit. que cum veniret eum visitare. fecit vt tota nocte cum eo moraretur. vir ei[us] venit et dum respiceret per fenestram cognouit eam esse cum hermita. et dum intus mitteret caput suum per fenestram hermita occidit eum. et ad mentem reuersus promisit se de cetero non iturum pedibus donec sciret peccatum sibi esse dimissum. transactis pluribus annis inuentus in nemore a uenatoribus et regi est presentatus et dum quidam puer de nouo baptizatus clamauit. dimissum est tibi peccatum tuum. culpam suam coram omnibus recognoscens super pedes abiit.

Another fourteenth-century text was printed in one of the first works devoted to medieval Latin story-telling, Wright's *Selection of*

¹ See Herbert, III, 131, No. 103 (Roy. 7. C. I).

² See Herbert, III, 571, No. 175.

Latin Stories.¹ It differs somewhat in phraseology from those that have preceded, but offers no other point of interest. And finally as concerns the Latin manuscripts of the British Museum, we may note the tale's appearance in a collection formed in northern Italy in the early years of the fifteenth century.² This is, so far as I recall, the only version reported from Italian soil, for the collectors of *novelle* show no familiarity with it. The text, which has the novelty of introducing incest and parricide into the story, seems to be the antecedent of some later German versions in jest-books. It is as follows:

Quidam fuit homagium dyabolo fecit ut ditaret eum. Cui ditato dixit dyabolus. Ecce feci uoluntatem tuam fac ergo tu et meam Qui ait quod uis ut faciam. et dyabolus ad eum inquit. Pecca cum sorore tua que est pulchra et iuuenis. qui noluit. Cui dyabolus. occide patrem tuum qui senex est et inutilis. qui noluit. Cui dyabolus. Bibe ergo tantum quod inebrieris. qui ait. Libenter faciam istud. Qui cum inebriatus fuisset sororem cognouit³ et patrem eum reprehendentem occidit.

The only vernacular version in the manuscripts of the Museum appears to be an insertion in a French translation of the *Alphabetum Narrationum*, for which I use Professor Williams' transcript.⁴ This tale is obviously a very immediate derivative of "Ivresse" in the *Vie des anciens pères*, which I have already discussed at length:

Vng diable tempta vne fois vng saint homme moult aigrement et le saint homme y resistoit au mieulx quil pouoit. Le diable luy dist vne fois quil ne le laisseroit jamais en paix sil ne choisiroit de trois pechez le quel quil vouldroit et lui promist que jncontinent quil en auroit choisy vng jamais ne se tempteroit apres. et luy mist a choiz mordre luxure ou glouttonnye. Le bon homme choisy pour le moindre pechie le pechie de glouttonnye. Assez tost apres jl ala veoir vne sienne cōmere et y fist sy bonne chiere quil fut yure. Et lors quil fut ainsy yure jl pria sa cōmere de folie. et tant ala la besoigne quil coucha avec elle charnellement. Quant jl fut hors de son vin et il pēsa ace quil auoit fait jl eust sy grant vergoigne et sy grant paour que son pechie ne fust sceu quil occist sa commere. et ainsy par lun pechie jl enchey en tous les autres.

¹ Percy Soc., 8, London, 1842, pp. 83-84, No. 97. It is translated in Wesselski, *Mönchslatein*, p. 99, No. 81. See also Herbert, III, 577, No. 37. Wright remarks (p. 235) that "the verses are taken from the Harleian MS; the tale partly from John of Bromyard." The story is found in the *exempla* of Bromyard under E, 1, 3, "Ebrietas."

² See Herbert, III, 648, No. 4, (Add. 27336, f. 2). For the various British Museum texts printed above I am obliged to Mr. A. J. Collins of the Department of Manuscripts.

³ Glossed in a later hand, "scilicet carnaliter."

⁴ See Herbert, III, 446, No. 21 (Roy. 15. D. V.).

Gloutonnye est vng perillex pechie car jl nest sy saige au monde qui ne soit hors de son sens quant jl est yure. et alors quil est yure jl est tabernacle au diable. Cest grant pechie de soy consentit a vng pechie mortel quelque petit quil semble. car jl est moult grant et grief. comme pechie soit de telle nature que lun pechie attrait lautre.

Inasmuch as our story appears not to have formed part of the regular stock of tales in the *Alphabetum Narrationum*—it does not appear in the British Museum manuscripts of the Latin text nor in the English translation edited by Mrs. M. M. Banks (E.E.T.S., 126–27, 1904–5)—it is not surprising to find that the French version just given does not agree throughout with the *exemplum* in the *Libro de los enxieptos*, a Spanish rendering of the *Alphabetum*.¹ Here the story is told in dialogue with biblical citations which vary from those used by the French narrator. The source of the Spanish version is not apparent, but since it is much condensed, it is a rather thankless task to speculate on the subject. The form of the story does not vary sufficiently from the versions current in the early Middle Ages to make one look elsewhere than in the collections of Latin *exempla* for its origin. Its presence in the Spanish translation does not prove, nor even suggest, that the tale was disseminated in Europe from Spain as a center, as B. Heller maintains. Long before the translation of the *Libro de los enxieptos* the story was known farther north in a more individual form.

The latest manuscript text I happen to have noted is preserved in the university library at Jena (El. fol. 99).² It is contained in a Latin interlinear version of a French *remaniement* of the *Disticha Catonis* entitled “Régime et gouvernement du corps et de l’âme” and was written at Torgau in 1496. Inasmuch as some of the stories—as yet unedited—in this codex exhibit curious individual modifications I print this text.

On list dung heremite qui souuent estoit temple de laisser son heremitage et de retourner au monde. Auquel saparut vng ange de par dieu son createur et luy dist, que sil vouloit retourner au monde quil ne pourroit eschaper que entre tous les aultres maulx et peches qui se font en cestui

¹ *Bibl. de Autores españoles*, LI, 461, No. 56. I do not print this easily accessible text.

² See Hilka, *Lit. bl.*, XL (1919), 311. The tale is on fol. 49. For this text I am indebted to Professor Hepding and Oberbibliothekar Dr. Bernhard Willkomm, of the Jena library. I do not print the Latin text.

monde quil en auoit trois. Desquels il failloit quil en cōmist vng. cest astauoir auarice luxure et yuresse. et quil esleust lequel il vouldroit [49^{vo}] comettre des trois. Lors hermite respondit et dist puis quil conuenoit quil comist lung desdis peches quil elisoit yuresse et non pas auarice. pource que auarice est la racine de tous peches. Ne aussy luxure. pource quelle gaste est destruit tout le corps de lome et ainsy le meschant retourna au monde. lequel vng iour beust si largement du vin quil fut yure et incontinent tempte du peche de luxure lequel peche cōmist de fait et apres deuint auaricieux et de fait se mist a emblit et par ainsy comist tous les trois peches. Cest astauoir auarice luxure et yuresse. et non yuresse tant seulement.

At this point the versions current in Germany during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries may be taken up. One of the three tragic tales in Jörg Wickram's *Rollwagenbüchlein* (1556), an addition to the original stock in the first edition of 1555, is an elaborate narrative of a man, who, to the disgust of his sister, becomes a hermit. When he learns through a dream that God wishes him to commit one of three sins, he invites his sister to visit him and to bring a bottle of wine—with the familiar consequences.¹ Wickram exclaims: "O trunckenheit, was stifftest du! Du bist nit das ringfügest laster under all ander laster." The source of Wickram's variations seems to be ultimately the *exemplum* of Italian authorship which I have printed above.

The source of the rather elaborate tale in Melander's *Joca et Seria*² is obscure. This version is particularly interesting because it represents the most ambitious effort at literary style. I print it because the text is difficult to get at:

De iuvene Parhisiensi, qui ebrius utrumque parentem instinctu Diaboli interfecit.

Argento quidam multo cumulatus et auro
 Parhisia iuuenis natus in vrbe fuit.
 Decoquit in Venere et lusu, multoque Lycae,
 Helluo quae tenuit plurima dona patris.
 Syluas post merens petiit nudatus, et agros,
 Vitam monticolas inter agitque feras.

¹ Ed. Bolte (Stutt. Lit. Ver., 229), p. 96, No. 72, cf. p. 383 and *Wickrams Werke*, VIII, 346; ed. Kurz, Leipzig, 1865, pp. 129-31 and 213. It is reprinted from *Schimpf und Ernst* (which took it from the *Rollwagenbüchlein*) in *Lessings Werke*, III, 2, *Dramatischer Nachlass* (ed. Boxberger), p. 166. An earlier reprinting is in *Jocoseria*, Lich, 1605, Teil 2, Nr. 373.

² Frankfurt, 1617-26, II, 249-50, No. 163. It is translated in *Jocoseria*, Lich, 1605, Teil 2, No. 222. The source is said to be D. Lossius, *Epigr.*, p. 226.

Hinc pudor, hinc malesuada fames, hinc vrget egestas,
 Et varias vitae suadet inire vias.
 Accedit Satanas, quid ait sic perdit solus
 Inter agis saeuas flensque dolensque feras?
 Aut laqueo vitam fini aut te mergito in vndas,
 Rupe aut excelsa te dato praecipitem.
 Quid vitam duces inter spelaea ferarum
 Desertam in syluis hic inopemque miser?
 Cum negat hoc facinus, Satanas quod suasit auerni,
 Corpori vt inferret funera dira suo.
 Reddam ego opes Daemon tibi dixit, vtrumque parentem
 Si intrepida occides gnatus in vrbe manu.
 Hoc etiam facinus gnatus cum denegat atrox,
 Tollere eos saeua qui genuere manu.
 Argentum, dixit, multum cumulabis et aurum,
 Quamque tibi nuper copia maior erit.
 Hebdomade aut zythi tantum aut si sumis Iacchi
 Ebrius vt fias mentis inopsque semel.
 Annuit hic Satanae gaudens adsuctus laccho,
 Hebdomade euacuat pocula plena semel.
 Diues fit subito magis et quo pocula siccant,
 Et furit insanus nocte dieque magis.
 Diuitiae crescunt, augetur luxus, et auctae
 Diuitiae vitiis dant alimenta malis.
 Increpuit potum crebro cum maior acerbe,
 Matrem transfigens ebrius ense patrem.
 Cum pater ob caedam matris reprehendit, et ipsum
 Ebrietate furens sustulit ense patrem.
 Cunctorum ebrietas quod fons et origo malorum
 Sit, docet exemplum caedis in orbe trucidis.
 Quanta sint fraudes Satanae, conamina quanta,
 Ducat vt incautos ad genus omne mali.
 Sobrius immanis quod non vult ante parentem,
 Ebrius heu gnatus tollit utrumque suum.

In the German translation of Melander's *Joca et Seria* there are four versions of our story. Three of these are simply translations or reprints of versions which have already been mentioned. The fourth is defective and poorly told. I print it from Professor Hepding's copy.

Bey einem Bürger war ein Geistlicher Bruder zu Hauss/ vnnd dienet Gott/ der hatte grosse Anfechtung von dem bösen Geist.

Er sagt einmal. Sag an du böser Geist/ was begerstu von mir/dass ich doch friedē habe: Der Teuffel sprach: Hab die Wahl vnder dreyen stücken/ brich die Ehe mit der Frawen/ bey deren du zu Hauss bist. Der Bruder wolt es nicht thun/ der Teuffel sprach: So sauff dich einmal woll Weins/ der Bruder sprach: Das will ich thun/ vnnd ward ein mal voll Weins/ da fiel er in Vnkeuschheit/ vnnd brach die Ehe mit der Frawen/ da kam der Mann darzu vnnd wolt ihn schlagen/ da schlug der Bruder ihn zu todt/ vnd thet die ding alle drey.¹

Jörg Wickram, who has just been mentioned, was, furthermore, the owner of a volume of *Meistergesänge* in which he entered his name with the date 1549 and the further notation that he had purchased it at Schlettstadt in 1546. The manuscript volume in question, composed for the Meistersinger of Colmar, was compiled in the fifteenth century and it is, it may be remarked in passing, one of the two chief sources of what is known about that school of poetry. In it is a version of the story with St. (or Pope) Urban as hero. It is possible, although far from certain, that Wickram took from this allusion the suggestion for the tale in the *Rollwagenbüchlein*. Both the *Meistergesang* and the jest-book mention incest as one of the three sins, although in the earlier composition it is incest with the mother and not, as in the *Rollwagenbüchlein*, with the sister. The *Meistergesang* further heightens the repulsiveness of the tale by substituting parricide for murder. It seems obvious that these changes (incest with the mother and parricide) have crept into the story under the influence of the legends of Judas, Gregory, Albanus Rex Ungariae, and the like. The Colmar *Meistergesang* begins with God insisting that St. Urban choose one of three sins. The two concluding stanzas are then put in the saint's mouth, with the result that the story is sadly marred by the shift in the point of view and by the excessive moralizing. Indeed, one is not sure that the three sins are actually committed, and the fate of the saint is left completely in the air.² Scarcely better as a literary product is a second *Meistergesang*, also composed in the fourteenth century.³ In it, too, nothing

¹ *Jocoseria, Das ist Schimpff vnd Ernst*, Lich, 1605, Teil 2, No. 374. This was taken from *Schertz mit der Warheydt*, Frankfurt, 1550, fol. 74.

² Bartsch, *Meisterlieder der Kolmarer Handschrift* (Stütt. Lit. Ver., 68, 1862), pp. 281–82, No. 25.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 598–99, No. 188 (from the Wilten MS; cf. pp. 92 ff., 117–18 and Zingerle, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, XXXVIII [1861], 53). It is also found in a Heidelberg MS; cf. Bartsch, p. 143, No. 58.

is said about the fate of the sinner. Two stanzas of this will tell the story:

Sant Urban dem wart für gegeben
driu dinc ân allez widerstreben,
dar ûz er einez für sich nemen solde.
Daz erste was diu trunkenheit,
daz ander wirt iuch wol geseit,
ob er den sînen vater tœten wolde.
Daz dritte ist gar unverswigen,
als ich iuch hie bediute:
er solt bî sîner muoter ligen.
der drîer wart er keins verzigen,
daz merket eben, ir werden cristenliute.

Die trunkenheit er an sich nam,
da mite er, in die sünde kam,
er beslief die muotr, den vater begund er tœten.
Do im diu trunkenheit verswant,
und er des wînes niht empfant,
er sprach 'der wîn tet mich der sache noeten.
Daz dunket mich ein swære pîn:
ich bin gevalln in schulde.'
wer hie ân sünde welle sîn,
hütet sich vor überigem wîn.
mit trunkenheit verliust man gotes hulde.

There is one more allusion to this legend about St. Urban. To the Swiss pamphleteer, Pamphilus Gengenbach, who is justly famed for his bitter satires on the Roman church, is ascribed the *Rebhänszlin* (i.e., men given over to drink) and in that portion of this composition entitled "Der zehend Segen" occurs the following passage:

Dann, weyn, du hast vil wunders than:
Ein heiliger Bapst, der hiess Vrban,
Dem thetst du auch ein Schafernack:
Er hatt dich truncken auff ein tag,
Dass er drei sünd darinn erkoss
Aber Gotts barmhertzigkeyt was so gross,
Dass er jm gab die hulde sein.¹

It will be observed that these stories in which St. Urban figures are current in southwestern Germany and Switzerland, and that else-

¹ *Gengenbach* (ed. Goedeke), Hannover, 1856, p. 521.

where the name of the saint is free from stain; but how they came to be thus associated with him is not obvious.

The story is brought into connection with another ecclesiastical personage, Bishop Fundanus, but this time the bishop is represented as being a spectator of an assembly of devils. Each one tells of his success in tempting mankind and one relates the story of the three sins as his feat.¹ This episode, Düntzer (*Lessing als Dramatiker*, p. 196) declares, was in Lessing's mind when he composed the first scene of his *Faust*. In this play of which we now have only the fragmentary outlines Beelzebub calls before him the lesser devils in order that they may give an accounting. One has set fire to a city, another has sunk a fleet, and a third "boasts of having seduced a holy man whom he had persuaded to become intoxicated, and who in his drunken state committed adultery and murder."² The easy success of these three leads then to conversation about the difficulty of leading Faust astray. Beyond these scanty indications we know no more concerning the exact form of the story Lessing had before him. The assembly of devils relating their accomplishments suggests connecting it with the previously cited legend of Bishop Fundanus.

Abraham a Sancta Clara may have another and quite different story in mind when he quotes:

Dives eram dudum,
fecerunt me tria nudum:
alea, vina, venus;
tribus his sum factus egenus.³

In the later centuries the story enjoyed only a moderate degree of popularity. The French seem to have preceded the Germans in its employment.⁴ I note Piron, "Laconisme," *Anthologie satyrique*,

¹ Angelinus Gazaeus, *Pia hilaria*, 1617. I have been unable to find a copy of this book in this country. For answers to inquiries I am indebted to the courtesy of the Librarian of Congress, of the Newberry Library, and of Harvard College Library and for assistance to Mr. James A. McMillen, of the Washington University Library.

² *Lessings Werke*, III, 2, *Dramatischer Nachlass* (ed. Boxberger), p. 166; R. Petsch, *Lessings Faustdichtung*, Heidelberg, 1911.

³ *Werke*, I, 304. Cf. F. Seiler, *Deutsche Spichwörterkunde*, 1922, p. 138.

⁴ I take these references from Bolte, *Montanus Schwankbücher*, p. 583. I have seen only the pretentious versification in the *Recueil de nouvelles poésies* (the source of which is uncertain) and the *Tidsfordriv* (which seems to be derived indirectly from Pauli's *Schimpf und Ernst*). Professor Hepding's transcripts of these texts have been deposited in the John G. White Collection.

I, 41, which may also be found in *La légende joyeuse ou les 101 leçons de Lampsaque* (1753), I, 44, No. 81; and *Recueil de nouvelles poésies galantes* (ca. 1750), I, 113, "Qui choisit prend le pire." D'Ancona (*La leggenda di Sant' Albano*, Bologna, 1865, p. 47, n. 1) says there is a versification by Grécourt. During this century it made its appearance in Denmark, finding its way into Danish texts of the Seven Wise Masters (*Historien om de syv vise mestere* [1733]; cf. Nyerup, *Morskabslæsning*, 1816, pp. 253, 263) and other jest-books with titles reminiscent of Pauli's work: *Skjemt og alvor* (1781), p. 162; *Tidsfordriv eller lystig selskabsbog* (1788), No. 19. About the middle of the century, as we have seen, Lessing alluded to the theme. Later Karl Wilhelm Ramler, who dazzled his age with his metrical cleverness, included it in his *Fabellese* (1783), I, 167, "Folgen des ersten Lasters." And finally Gottlieb Konrad Pfeffel, a blind Alsatian educator, tells it under the title "Die Wahl" as follows:

Graf Hunerich, ein deutscher Mann,
Hielt sich und seinem Weib,
Frau Hedwig, einen Schlosskaplan
Zum frommen Zeitvertreib.

Der Mönch vergass beim leckern Tisch
Des Grafen sein Breiver;
Ass auch am Freitag selten Fisch,
Trank lieber Wein als Bier.

Einst weckt ihm was um Mitternacht;
Dar stand mit stillem Grimm,
Gehörnt, in schwefelgelber Tracht
Fürst Lucifer vor ihm.

Wähl, sprach er, unter dreien eins:
Ermorde Hunerich,
Entehr sein Weib, sauf dich voll Weins,
Sonst hol ich morgen dich.

Er wählt die Flasche, treibt berauscht
Mit Hedwig frevle Lust
Und stösst dem Mann, der sie belauscht,
Ein Messer in die Brust.¹

¹ *Poetische Versuche*, II (1803), 23.

We now come to the occurrences of the tale in modern folk-tradition. In Europe it has been taken down in Ireland, France, Germany, Poland, Russia, and Esthonia.¹ The Arabic versions current in Africa have already been considered. The various European folk-versions differ rather interestingly among themselves and, although they show evidences of a rather long period of independent development, seem one and all to be traceable to a single archetype. The emphasis in these modern tales is slightly different from that of the medieval stories. The modern narrators endeavor to make the act of selecting one of the three sins seem plausible and hit upon various devices to convince the auditor that a choice was necessary. The medieval tellers of the story did not face this problem at all.

An Irish version is without a single interesting trait: the story is identical with the *exemplum* in the French translation of the *Alphabetum Narrationum* as printed above and with "Ivresse" of the *Vie des anciens pères*. In Provence they tell it with a novel and psychologically ingenious introduction:

A monk who is vexed at his superior committed the crime of wishing his death. The superior was stricken with apoplexy and died instantly. Thereupon the Devil appeared to the guilty monk, saying, "I have heard your prayer, and you in your turn must do something for me: drink, sin in adultery, or commit murder: choose." He hesitated long and finally after selecting the least crime was guilty of them all.

Farther north in Picardy, there is current among the folk a variant of "Ivresse" which begins with the Devil's threat to destroy everything unless God permits a pious monk to commit one sin. In the Ardennes the theme is strangely modified and acquires something of the flavor of Goethe's *Faust*:

In a monastery where all had been accustomed to drinking wine one of the monks on finishing his glass cried to the Devil: "I give you my soul, but

¹ Brueyre, *Contes populaires de la Grande Bretagne*, Paris, 1875, p. 332, No. 81 (from Kennedy; I have not troubled to run down the English original because of its lack of interest); L. J. B. Béranger-Feraud, *Superstitions et survivances*, IV (Paris, 1896), 422-23; Carnoy, *Littérature populaire de la Picardie*, Paris, 1883, pp. 134-47, "Les trois péchés de l'ermite"; A. Meyrac, *Traditions, coutumes, légendes et contes des Ardennes*, Charleville, 1890, pp. 346-47, "Comment le moine perdit son âme" (I am not so certain that this tale belongs exactly here; but B. Heller regards it as a variant and it is surely related to the tales mentioned at the end of this article); A. Schreiber, *Sagen aus den Rheingegenden*, Frankfurt am Main, 1848, pp. 270-71, No. 28, "Der Langenstein"; Kolberg, *Krakowskie*, IV, 146-48, "O kuszącym do pijanstwa." Kraszewski's tale appeared in A. Pienkiewicz, *Bojanie*, Vilna, 1838, pp. 93-102, "Yako sathan kusił pustelnika na puszcze." Tolstoi's allusion may be found in "God or Mammon," *Works* (tr. Wiener), XXIII (Boston, 1905), 83-84.

you must not deny me any wish, any earthly enjoyment." To this the Devil assented. When the monk was sober he prayed repentantly. Then a secret voice spoke, saying, "Your repentance is sincere, but you shall escape Hell only if you win a soul for Heaven." With God's consent the Devil brought a beautiful maiden to the hermit and, falling with her, he lost his soul.

The German tale, a Rhenish legend, is particularly noteworthy for its introductory episode, which has no parallel that I am aware of:

The Devil watched a usurer bury his money and decided that stealing it would bring the man to despair and suicide. He proved to be correct in his expectation and inherited the usurer's gold. This he offered to a youth if he would commit one of the three sins—and the rest of the story follows the well-worn track.

Łopacinski prints a summary of a folk-tale taken down by Oscar Kolberg and a very full analysis of a story by Kraszewski. His article was suggested by Tolstoi's employment of the tale which was, he believes, due to the Russian novelist's familiarity with the version of Kraszewski. On looking at them both one wonders what connection he saw between them. Kraszewski tells the story as follows:

A pious hermit was guilty of thinking that God had freed him from sin and that Satan could no longer tempt him. As punishment God permitted Mephistopheles to do what he could. But for more than a year the devil's efforts were in vain. Finally when the hermit was meditating on his youth and on a beautiful horse his father had once given him, he involuntarily uttered these words, "Oh! if it were possible at least to see such a horse." The waiting devil seized the opportunity and, taking the shape of the horse, came before the hermit. When he had mounted on it, it rose into the sky so that he thought for a moment that he was being borne to Heaven, a second Elijah. High above the earth the devil threatened to cast him down unless he would commit at least one of three sins. The course of the story then follows the model of "Ivresse"—with the addition that the hermit confesses his sins to his captors and is set free in order that he may return to his former mode of life.

Tolstoi's version with its novel and rather inappropriate beginning may have been suggested by the foregoing, but I see little reason for so thinking. It is verbatim as follows:

There is an old story about a monk who disputed with the Devil, saying that he would not let him into his cell, but if he let him in, he would do the Devil's bidding. The story tells how the Devil assumed the form of a wounded raven, with a broken wing, who leaped about pitifully near the

door of the monk's cell. The monk took pity on the raven with the broken and bleeding wing and took him into his cell.

Kolberg's folk-version is particularly noteworthy because it leads on to the Esthonian variants instead of looking back, as Kraszewski's tale does, to the Rhine. Of course it is, like practically all the folk-versions mentioned, a descendant of "Ivresse" in the *Vie des anciens pères*, as would be obvious from comparing the descriptions of the details of the three crimes in both texts. The new trait which unites the Polish and some of the Esthonian tales is the introductory episode (which may be paralleled in the Rhenish legend). Briefly Kolberg's tale is as follows:

A farm-servant chanced upon a little man in a forest jingling a bag of coins. The stranger offered him the money, should he obligate himself to commit adultery, or murder, or get drunk. He agreed to the last, and, taking the bag, bought sufficient liquor at the next inn. When he came home he did not find his master there and regaled himself on the household stock of vodka. The master on returning found him in a compromising situation, beat him and his own wife, and was murdered. The servant ran to the woods to find his seducer and since he failed in that, hanged himself.

It is quite clear on reading the Esthonian versions which I print below that they are derived for the most part from something very similar to Kolberg's tale, and that goes back to the Rhine and to "Ivresse" of the *Vie des anciens pères*. The five versions here printed for the first time are taken from the enormous manuscript collections of Dr. J. Hurt (d. 1907), which include upwards of 10,000 tales and legends. Antti Aarne has indexed the material in *FF Communications*, 25 (Hamina, 1918). For transcripts and translations of the five tales listed under No. 839* I am indebted to Dr. E. A. Tunkelo of the Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura (Helsingfors) and the mediation of Professor Arthur G. Brodeur; the original copies I have given to the John G. White Collection of the Cleveland Public Library, where the Esthonian text may be found. The first and second of these tales were taken down at times about ten years apart from the same narrator. The fifth tale is particularly interesting for its reminiscence of the assembly of devils, a trait which recalls Lessing's version of the story.

1. MS A 8. 41 (6): "Die Macht des Branntweins":

In einer stockfinstern Nacht kam ein Trinker gegen Mitternacht mit benebeltem Kopfe aus dem Wirtshaus nach Hause. Er irrte kreuz und quer herum, und war flitschnass, wie ein Schiffsbrüchiger, c'er soeben von den Wellen an das Ufer geschleudert worden ist. In diesem elenden Zustande irrte er bis zur Mitternacht, konnte aber keinen Weg finden. Er war wahrscheinlich, wie man zu sagen pflegt, "auf die Spuren des alten Bösen geraten."

In seinem unglücklichen Zustande setzte er sich nieder und fing an in die Nacht hinein zu sprechen und sich jemanden zur Hilfe zu rufen, um ihn nach Hause zu begleiten. Er rief nach allen Guten Engeln, er rief nach allen Bösen Geistern—aber niemand schien zu kommen. Noch feuriger und heisser, wie ein Wahnsinniger, fing er an auf eine schauerliche Weise zu fluchen, und den bösen Geist, wenn es solch einen gibt, sich mit schrecklicher Stimme zum Wegweiser zu bitten. Es verging nicht viel Zeit—da erschien jemand mit feurigen Augen und Zähnen wie Kienspäne und fing an mit dem Manne, der zitternd aufstand und vor dem Greuel stand, mit quarrig-unangenehmer Stimme zu sprechen: "Höre, Mann, was willst du von mir?" Stotternd antwortete der Mann: "I—i—ich wollte mir einen Begleiter." Der Quarrende sagte: "Wenn du eine von diesen vier Sünden machen willst, die ich dir jetzt nennen werde, werde ich dich augenblicklich nach Hause begleiten. Diese Sünden sind: entweder du betrinkst dich von neuem, oder stiehlest, oder brichst die Ehe, oder du tötest jemanden. Wähle!" Der Mann dachte: "Wenn ich stehle, ist das ein Unrecht; Ehebruch ist eine schreckliche Sünde; wenn ich jemanden töte, dann ist es schon eine blutige Sünde. Nein, von diesen wähle ich keine. Wenn ich noch einmal mich mich betrinke, was schadet es mir oder anderen? Das Betrinken, das werde ich wählen, dann werde ich zu Hause auf geheiztem Ofen mich erwärmen können." Er sagte dem Wartenden: "Es ist gut, ich wähle das Betrinken." "Dann geh' gleich in das Wirtshaus zurück," sagte der schreckliche Fremde, "und erfülle dein Versprechen." Der arme Mann entschuldigte sich: "Ach, warum soll' ich eben in das Wirtshaus gehen, ich habe ja nichts mit des Königs Namen [Geld] in der Tasche." Da zog der schreckliche Fremde mit der Hand in die dunkle Nacht so dass ein blauer Streifen nachblieb und sagte dem Manne: "Öffne deinen Schoss, hier ist Geld." Darauf legte er eine Menge Gold- und Silbergeld in seinen Schoss, begleitete ihn auf den Wirtshausweg und verschwand selbst wie der alte Mond. Der Mann ging mit seinem vielen Gelde in das Wirtshaus, trank dort selbst einige Tage und gab allen seinen Kneipfreunden zu trinken wie ein König der Goldpfennige. Doch endlich kam die Zeit, dass nach dem Trinken und der Völlerei des Mannes, endlich das Geld zu Ende ging. Was nun anfangen? Wo Geld bekommen? Da sah er, dass der Wirt der Dienstmagd ihr Gehalt bezahlte, den sie in einen Lappen gewickelt, unter das

Stroh ihres Bettes steckte. In seiner Branntweingier, um seinen Vater zu restaurieren, schlich er sich zum Bett der Magd, nahm von dort das Geld der armen Dienerin, kaufte viel Branntwein, trank selbst und gab auch seinen Kneipfreunden freudlichst zu trinken.

Zuletzt kam er gegen Abend nach Hause, drang mit Gewalt zu der Frau eines anderen Mannes, der im selben Hause wohnte, aber noch nicht zu Hause war. Als er gerade bei dieser schrecklichen Sündentat war, kam der andere Mann zufällig gerade zur Tür hinein und den Notschrei seiner Frau hörend, lief er ihr zur Hilfe. Da ergriff der Betrunkene einen Holzscheid aus der Ecke und schlug den anderen Mann so stark auf den Kopf dass dieser, entseelt, niederfiel und tot liegen blieb.

Darauf lief die Frau mit grossem Geschrei und Weinen in das Dorf, von wo dann Menschen kamen und alles so fanden, wie die Frau erzählt hatte. Dann sah der Mann wohl was er gemacht hatte, als man ihm als Mörder und Räuber an Händen und Füssen band und am nächsten Morgen früh vor das Gutsgericht brachte, von wo er natürlich vor ein grosseres Gericht geschickt wurde, der ihm nach Gesetz und Urteil als Mörder, für sein ganzes Leben nach Sibirien verurteilte, damit er da Gold grabend, über die Macht des Branntweins nachdenken könnte.

Ach, wenn doch alle Trinker daran dächten und sich zeitig von der Macht des Branntweins und den Banden des "Bayrischen" befreien. Wenn dieses auch nicht alle nach Sibirien befördert, aber ein unglückliches Leben bringt das Trinken doch mit sich und zuletzt schickt es sie in das feurige Verderben, denn "Trinker sollen nicht in das Reich Gottes kommen."

2. MS B 72. 191 (35): "Die vier Gebote des alten Bösen":

Ein blutarmer Mann kehrte aus dem Walde vom Holzhacken nach Hause, die Ast auf der Schulter. Er seufzte schwer und tief: "Ach über das Leben der Armen. Arbeite von ganzer Kraft, aber hungrig bist du dabei doch. Es ist klar dass Gott die Arbeit von mir, Armen, nicht segnet." Auf einmal erschien aus dem dunklen Walde ein schwarzes altes Männlein und blieb auf dem Wege vor dem Manne stehen wie ein Pfosten. Der arme Mann erschrak sehr. Das schwarze Männlein sprach freundlich: "Hörst du, armer Mann, warte ein wenig, ich will dir was sagen. Willst du reich werden? Du siehst ja selbst dass deine Arbeit dich nicht ernährt. Erfülle meine Gebote, dann wirst du ohne Arbeit reich und kannst ohne Sorgen leben. Ich habe nicht zehn Gebote, wie die Anderen, ich habe deren nur vier. Erfülle auch nur ein Gebot, ich bin auch damit zufrieden und gebe dir dafür allerlei irdisches Gut." Diese lockende Rede war dem armen Mann lieb zu hören. Er fragte: "Sag' denn, welches sind diese vier Gebote?" Das alte Männlein, niemand anderes als der alte Böse, antwortete: "Fange an zu trinken. Das zweite Gebot: Fange an zu stehlen. Das dritte Gebot: Geh' zur Frau eines anderen. Das vierte Gebot: Fange an andere Menschen zu töten." Der arme Mann hörte ihm in Gedanken zu. Als der alte Böse

ihm diese vier Gebote vorgelesen hatte, sagte er: "Nun, wähle! Ein Gebot kannst du erfüllen, wenn du reich werden willst und aus deiner blutigen Armut in einen besseren Zustand kommen willst." Der arme Mann dachte und dachte—und kam endlich zum Entschluss: "Das Töten eines Menschen ist eine grosse und blutige Sünde. Zur Frau eines anderen zu gehen ist eine schreckliche Unflätigkeit und furchtbare Sünde; das Stehlen ist auch eine schreckliche Sache; das Trinken—ja damit schade ich niemanden, ich kann im Wirtshaus trinken wieviel Herzensbegehrt—wen schadet's." Dann sagte er zum Bösen: "Gut! Ich werde dein erstes Gebot erfüllen, doch ich habe kein Geld zum Trinken." Der alte Böse antwortete: "Dafür sollst du nicht sorgen brauchen." Er machte mit den Händen einige Bewegungen in der Luft, da waren seine beiden Hände voll Silber und Gold, welches er dem armen Manne in den Schoß warf, ihm zurufend: "Da hast du Geld genug. Wenn dieses zu Ende geht, werde ich dir schon wieder neues besorgen." Der alte Böse verschwand.

Der arme Mann ging mit dem vielen Gelde am Wirtshause vorüber. Er hörte von da das Lärmen und Schreien der Trinker, ihren frohen, lustigen Gesang, ihr Jubeln und Tanzen. Er ging auch hinein. Da er Geld hatte, nahm er für den Anfang gegen seine grosse Mühe ein halbes Hof Brantwein und fing an zu trinken. Freunde waren um ihn wie Mücken. Er bestellte ein zweites halbes Hof, und als dieses auch zu Ende war,—ein drittes. So tranken sie bis zur Mitternacht, dann war des Mannes Geld aus. Da sah er dass der Wirt zehn Rubel in die Tasche eines am Nagel hängenden Ueberrockes steckte. Er stahl es, und hatte Geld um mit seinen Freunden wieder zu kneipen. Als auch dieses Geld aus war, ging der Mann in der zweiten Nacht nach Hause, und dort gleich zu der Frau eines anderen Mannes, der gerade von einer Fahrt zurückkehrte, ertappte den Verbrecher und fing mit ihm an zu zanken. Der Mann geriet darauf in Wut, er ergriff aus der Ecke ein Holz und schlug damit den Mann auf den Schädel. Der Schädel brach. Der Mann starb sogleich. Die vier Gebote des alten Bösen waren so durch die Erfüllung des ersten, des Trinkens, alle erfüllt worden. Nach einigen Tagen wurde der Mann als Mörder und Räuber nach Sibirien verschickt. Da hatte er den vom alten Bösen versprochenen Lohn.

O, ihr Trinker, ihr Trinker. Das erste Gebot des alten Bösen ist das Trinken, und dadurch werden auch alle seine anderen Gebote erfüllt. Erschreckt euch das nicht?

3. MS A 9. 216 (201): "Soll eine Sünde begehen, begeht aber drei":

Es lebte einmal ein frommer alter Junggeselle, der in seinem Leben noch nie gesündigt hatte, denn er war sehr fromm und gottesfürchtig und hütete sich auch vor der kleinsten Sünde. Wie er so schon recht alt geworden war, und noch immer nicht gesündigt hatte, da wurde ihm in Traume gesagt, dass er vor dem Tode doch einmal sündigen müsse, sonst könne er nicht sterben.

(Wer keine Sünde begehe, dem gäbe, nach der Volkssage, Gott selbst eine Sünde, die er vor dem Tode begehen müsse; sonst sei es nicht möglich zu sterben.) Ihm wurden drei Sünden vorgelegt, von denen er selbst eine zum Begehen auswählen sollte. Diese Sünden waren: sich einmal ordentlich zu betrinken, oder die Ehe zu brechen, oder einen Menschen zu töten. Der Mann dachte lange nach, bevor er eine auswählte, nämlich die Sünde des Trinkens, weil er dachte, dass dieses wohl die kleinste und am leichtesten zu begehende Sünde sei. Er ging dann in das Wirtshaus und betrank sich das erste Mal im Leben recht gründlich. Als er jetzt mit benebeltem Kopfe und schwankenden Schrittes vom Wirtshaus heim ging, führte sein Weg ihn an einer Käte vorüber, wo eine Kätnerin wohnte deren Lebensweise und Sitten im Dorfe viel Gesprächstoff gaben. Da dachte der betrunkene fromme Mann: "Ich habe wohl noch nie bei einer Frau geschlafen, aber was Wunder, wenn ich auch diesen Spass noch vor dem Tode durchmachen—und solch eine Kätnerin ist hier ja auch zu haben."—Er trat auch in die Hütte ein, wo die Frau ihn recht liebenswürdig empfing und sich sehr freute dass auch der fromme Mann zu ihr zu Besuch gekommen sei. Wie sie nun da beide mit dieser schlechten Kätnerin im Bette waren, kam ihr Mann, der im Dorfe arbeitete, nach Hause. Sobald er den frommen Mann bei seiner Frau sah, geriet er in höchste Wut und wollte ihm totschiessen. Aber der fromme Mann war viel geschwinder, als der Kätner, ergriff eine kleine Bank aus der Ecke der Hütte und schlug den Kätner auf den Kopf, worauf dieser sofort tot niederfiel. Nun war auch der Kopf des frommen Mannes vom Schnapsdunst klar geworden und beim Anblick seiner Sünden, die er begangen hatte, schämte und fürchtete er sich sehr und entfloh. Er hatte wohl zuerst nur eine Sünde begangen, daraus waren aber drei grosse Sünden gewachsen.

Das Branntweintrinken ist die allergrösste Sünde, und ihm entspringen alle anderen Sünden.

4. MS C 13. 402 (1):

In alter Zeit kam der Böse zu einem Manne, fing mit ihm an zu handeln, und wollte ihn zu Bösem verlocken und stellte ihm Fragen vor: "Willst du stehlen? Willst du zu der Frau eines anderen Mannes gehen oder willst du anfangen zu trinken?" Der Mann dachte: "Wenn ich stehle, dann werde ich in's Gefängnis gebracht,—wenn ich zur Frau eines anderen gehe, dann werde ich geprügelt; aber wenn ich Branntwein trinke, dann fehlt mir nichts." Er sagte dem Bösen auch dass er das Trinken wähle. Aber was sprang dann der Alte vor Freude, als er diese Worte hörte. Er wusste wohl, dass der Mann jetzt zu allem fähig ist und war es nicht so! Der Mann wurde Trinker, wurde dann Verbrecher und später auch Dieb und bekam Prügel auch und wurde ins Gefängnis geworfen auch.

5. MS A 1. 401 (3):

Einmal berieten sich die Teufel, wie die Menschen doch etwas jünger sterben würden. Der Erste sagte: "Man muss die Pest auf die Erde

schicken." Die anderen Teufel sagten: "Dieser Rat hilft nicht, denn die Pest lässt noch Menschen nach, die doch alt werden." Dann sagte der zweite Teufel: "Vielleicht hilft meine Weisheit? Wir müssen Krieg und Hungersnot auf die Erde schicken." Die anderen sagten wiederum: "Auch dieser Rat hilft nicht; der verdirbt das Land." Der dritte Teufel sagte: "Aber vielleicht hilft meine Weisheit. Bauen wir eine Schnapsbrennerei. Dadurch verlieren die Menschen ihre Gesundheit und Kraft und fangen an jünger zu sterben." Die anderen Teufel waren damit zufrieden und ehren diesen einen Teufel jetzt als den höchsten und weisesten, der auf diese Weisheit kam.

Einmal traf ein Teufel einen frommen Mann, machte ihn stolz auf sein Geld und sagte ihm: "Du hast Geld wie Quark. Was willst du jetzt am liebsten tun—trinken oder huren oder stehlen, lügen oder betrügen?" Der Mann dachte etwas nach und sagte dann: "Am liebsten fange ich an zu trinken, trinken kann ich für mein Geld." Der Teufel sagte: "Du bist jetzt wirklich ein Mann, weil du nur wenigstens etwas versprochen hast. Du bist reich, du kannst trinken und lasse keinen nicht dürsten, der dir mit trockenem Munde zuschaut." Der Mann fing an zu trinken und im trunkenen Mute zu huren. Endlich ging sein Geld zu Ende, bald hatte er kein Geld mehr um Brantwein zu kaufen. Dann fing der Mann an zu stehlen, zu lügen und andere zu betrügen, wo er nur die Möglichkeit hatte. So hatte der Mann durch das Trinken alle die Aufgaben erfüllt, die der alte Böse ihm vorgelegt hatte. Darum hüte sich jederman vor Brantwein-trinken, denn das ist das erste Netz, welches der Teufel den Menschen ausbreitet.

Before concluding it is necessary to examine hastily a tale with a long history which has been frequently associated and confused with that of the hermit's three sins. In the version of the *Vie des anciens pères* it is known as "Coq"; in the *exempla* of Jaques de Vitry it is given the title "De heremita cui dyabolus in specie hominis ministrabat, et quomodo decepit eum."¹ The substance of the *exemplum* is as follows:

The Devil had long sought to delude a hermit and observing that the hermit was finding difficulty in waking in the morning, he suggested the pur-

¹ *Jaques de Vitry* (ed. Frenken, *Quellen u. Unters. zur lat. Philo.*, V, i, Munich, 1914, pp. 111-12, No. 25 and see also p. 61; ed. Greven, *Samml. mittellat. Texte*, 9, pp. 21-22, No. 25). The version in *Bibl. nat. fonds lat. 18134*, cited as A.N. 7 by Frenken, is summarized by P. Meyer, in *Les contes moralisés de Nicole Bozon*, 1886, p. 297. In an abridgement of the work of Etienne de Bourbon, preserved in a British Museum manuscript (Add. 28682), this story is ascribed to Jaques de Vitry; see Herbert, *Cat. of Rom.*, III, 87, No. 52.

It is clear that Jaques de Vitry's tale is a combination of two themes, for Bozon tells the episode of the cock and hen independently; see *Contes moralisés*, pp. 186-88, 297 and Etienne's version, *loc. cit.*

chase of a cock. The cock crowed for some time and when it stopped the Devil suggested the further purchase of a hen. By the example of the cock and the hen the hermit was led into temptation: he fell with a girl, killed her to conceal the crime, and then realizing the enormity of his sins, prayed to God for forgiveness.

Parallel to Jaques de Vitry, but apparently neither his source nor derived from him, is the contemporary Old French narrative in the *Vie des anciens pères*, termed "Coq" and having the title "De l'ermite que le deable conchia du coc et de la geline."¹ The French tale has no reawakening of the girl in answer to the hermit's prayers, and is therefore, thinks Frenken, unoriginal, for the Italian prose and verse legends of St. Albano and St. Chrysostom contain the conclusion with the death of the girl. Juan Ruiz' version in the *Libro de Buen Amor*,² which was finally brought to an end in 1343, must however, be derived from the tradition represented by the *Vie des anciens pères*, for it contains both the incident of the cock and the hen—somewhat abbreviated, to be sure—and there is no mention of the resuscitation of the girl. It is entirely possible that the Arch-priest of Hita took the story from the French compilation, either in a French or a Spanish version, inasmuch as the somewhat earlier *Castigos é Documentos de Don Rey Sancho* frankly acknowledge their indebtedness as regards this particular story to "las historias de las vidas de los santos padres."³ Also analogous to the narrative in the Old French version and pretty certainly tracing its origin from the same source is the *Leggenda divota del Romito de' Pulcini*, first published in 1572.⁴ D'Ancona, the editor, remarks that it is not derived "dalla vita dei Santi padri"; but gives no reason for his opinion. Inasmuch as it appears regularly in the Old French *Vie des anciens pères* (but not in the *Vitas Patrum*), there would seem to be no difficulty about its source.

¹ Méon, *Nouveau recueil de fabliaux*, II (1823), 362 ff.; Legrand d'Aussy, IV (1779-81), 134 ff., V, 179; Romania, XIII (1884), 240, No. 64; Tobler, *Jahrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, VII (1866), 419. Méon's text is 120 lines longer than Tobler's.

² Ed. Cejador y Frauca (Clásicos Castellanos, 14), I (Madrid, 1913), 195-98; ed. Janer (*Bibl. de aut. esp.*, 57), p. 243; ed. J. Ducamin (*Bibl. méridionale*, Ser. 1, 6), 1901, str. 528-47.

³ *Bibl. de aut. esp.*, LI, 163 (*Castigos*, c. xxxix).

⁴ See d'Ancona, *Poemetti pop. ital.*, pp. 6-14, where the *Leggenda* is reprinted from his *Due farse del sec. XVI*, Bologna, 1882, pp. 130 ff.

Into an examination of the other stories with which the *exemplum* of the three sins has been associated by commentators it does not seem profitable to enter. The results of the foregoing exhibit may now be brought together. The wide dissemination in Europe of the *exemplum* started presumably with its inclusion in the Old French *Vie des anciens pères* in the latter half of the thirteenth century.¹ From that time until now the story has been widely known and told. The obvious unfamiliarity of the Italian *novellieri* is strange; I have not noted its appearance in one of the many Italian collections. The folk-versions seem to be more or less remote descendants of "Ivresse" and presuppose no other source. The advance of the story into Poland and Esthonia shows the influence of Western Europe on folk-tradition in those countries, a familiar fact. The *exemplum* rises once, in the hands of Lessing, to the antechamber of literature.

In the Near East the story was told in two forms, both still current as folk-story, the Hārūt-Mārūt versions and the legend of Baršīšā. The former will be passed over for the time being. The Baršīšā stories containing the familiar triad of drunkenness, adultery (fornication), and murder, with the added motive of the sinner's worship of the Devil made their way by translation into seventeenth-century Europe and maintained themselves in literary circles until given final and permanent form in *The Monk* and *Die Elxiere des Teufels*. These stories, although current among the Mohammedan folk, never became popular in Europe. The history of the legend of Baršīšā is rather obscure and difficult to trace. Perhaps it will be simpler to go backward. Within the present generation the story of the three sins has been told in Africa in a form which does not vary

¹ This dissemination did not begin in Spain and spread thence to the North, as B. Heller (p. 672): "Die Erzählung drang durch Spanien in die Nationalliteraturen der romanischen Völker") would have it. The version he ascribes to Don Juan Manuel, i.e., *El Libro de los Enziemplos*, has long been recognized as a translation of the *Alphabetum Narrationum*. Although the *exemplum* in question is not found in the Latin *Alphabetum* there is no reason for believing it to be Spanish. By the time of the appearance of the *Libro* the *exemplum* had become part of the general stock in trade of the preaching orders, for it is found in the contemporary *Speculum Laicorum* and in a French translation of the *Alphabetum*. Juan Ruiz must have taken the story in the *Libro de Buen Amor* from the *Vie des anciens pères*; at any rate the version of the *Vie* was known in Spain before the publication of the *Libro de Buen Amor*; and finally Juan Ruiz' tale is not the same thing as the *exemplum*. The third and last early Spanish allusion is the passage in the *Libro de Apollonio*, and this is so brief that it merely proves that the story was then known in Spain. The story is not more popular in Spain than elsewhere and it is not found there in forms which can be shown to antedate those current farther north either in regard to structure or in regard to time.

essentially from that current in Europe. It is rather widely distributed along the east coast for it has been reported as current among the Suaheli and farther south in Zanzibar. There is no reason for thinking that these versions are of European origin. And any doubt on this point is put at rest when one recalls that the legend of Barşîşâ came into Europe with full acknowledgment of its indebtedness to a Turkish source, the *Forty Veziers* of the fifteenth century. About this time, that is to say the middle of the fifteenth century, we are told that the story of the three sins was a hackneyed theme in Turkish literature. The story is, therefore, a familiar one in the Levant where it appears in forms with greater or less resemblance to the European *exemplum* while in Europe all existing versions can without much effort be referred to a single prototype, the *exemplum* of the three sins. According there can be no reason for doubting that the story of the three sins came from the East to Europe, although the route is not entirely clear.

On recalling the legend of Barşîşâ in detail once more it will be noticed that it exhibits some striking differences from the *exemplum* of the three sins, and by considering these it is possible to push farther back in the antecedent history of the story. In the legend of Barşîşâ the number *three* has receded into the background, the fall of the Turkish holy man exemplifies the frailty of man and not, as in the European and later Arabic texts, the dangers of wine-bibbing and the succession of sins that develop therefrom. In other words the history of the *exemplum* in Europe deals with a narrative underscoring the regular progression from drunkenness to murder, a narrative which is, notwithstanding the many minor variations I have noted, practically the same from its first appearance in the thirteenth century down to the latest collection of folk-tales. The interest hinges on explaining how the hermit got into the scrape, how the Devil was able to exert pressure on him. The Levantine and Mohammedan versions on the other hand include recent texts of popular origin which do not differ greatly from the European stories and then prior thereto a series of tales which are closely linked together by the employment of the same name, Barşîşâ, and which diverge, as we go back, increasingly from the outline of the *exemplum*. The interest here turns on the illustrating of the Devil's success in tempting man.

To attempt to trace the story farther is a rather vain task. The early versions of the legend of Baršîšâ do not display the individuality characteristic of the *exemplum*. Bernhard Heller points out that the earliest versions of the tale told by Al Samarqandî may be found in the *Tafsîr* of Tabari (839-921) in explanation of Surah 59, 16; but here they are no longer connected with the name Baršîšâ. These as the earliest attainable forms of the story I quote from Heller:

(1) A hermit served God for 60 years. Satan lay long in wait for him, clouded the senses of a girl, recommended her sisters to send her to the hermit. The hermit overpowered her, killed, and concealed her. On the threshold of the court he acknowledged Satan, but the Devil denied him.

(2) The hermit sinned with a shepherdess. Satan made the crime known to her four sisters by a dream. All were surprised to learn that the dreams were identical and demanded the punishment of the hermit from the king. He was denied by Satan.

(3) Three brothers went on a journey and left their sister with a hermit. He buried his victim under a tree, etc.

(4) The hermit has power over the Jinn. He sinned with an insane girl and in prison gave himself up to Satan.

Beyond these, the oldest known versions of the story which developed in the fulness of time into the *exemplum* of the three sins, it is probably impossible to go without entering upon the discussion of a different story, the incident of the saint's (hermit's) temptation and thereby upon a hagiological study.

The story of Hārūt and Mārūt has been passed over for the time being, and there is no space for an elaborate examination of it. The three most significant studies of the tale, those by Max Grünbaum, Enno Littmann, and Bernhard Heller, are entirely independent of one another and are far from exhausting the subject which has the most surprising ramifications. The established facts seem to be (1) that the Hārūt-Mārūt story is ultimately of Persian origin; (2) that it is intimately associated with the mythology of the stars, especially of the planet Venus; and finally (3) that the story has been much modified in its various forms, having attracted to itself a considerable amount of extraneous matter. The simplest version of the story, which Heller evidently considers very much like the primitive form of the myth, is as follows:

The angels Hārūt and Mārūt laid suit to Zuharat, a Persian beauty. Zuharat learned from them the magic name of God, by virtue of which the

ascended to Heaven. She uttered it, ascended, and took her place among the stars, i.e., as Venus.

This may be compared with the greatly expanded version I have printed above, but there is no occasion to discuss the differences.¹ In point of time this material long antedates the earliest mention of the legend of Barșîșă and B. Heller holds (p. 671) that the legend is an outgrowth of it. But this complex of mythology and hagiology was the parent of more than the *exemplum* of three sins; to it may be traced the legends of saints tempted by devils, and particularly such narratives as the legends of SS. Jehan Paulus,² Albano, John Chrysostomus, and Giovanni Boccadoro. And these legends others have promised to examine.

The following points have, I think, been established: the *exemplum* of the three sins is a distinct and readily recognizable story which has maintained itself in Europe for seven centuries, to this *exemplum* there are Levantine parallels which, the farther back one traces them, become involved in greater and greater obscurity and which tend toward increasing disintegration and instability as regards the incidents composing the *exemplum*. Thus one may justly say that the whole history of the *exemplum* has here been laid before us, from its evolvment out of a chaos of hagiological incidents down to its fixation in literature.³

ARCHER TAYLOR

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS

¹ This legend was taken over by the Jews, see B. Heller, "La chute des anges Schem-hazai, Quzze et Azaël," *Rev. des études juives*, LXI (1910), 202-12.

² Important as being the first vernacular version; see *Rev. des lang. rom.*, LVI (1913), 425-45.

³ Since this article has been set Professor George L. Hamilton has sent me still another version, which is pretty certainly the source of the tale in the *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry* (on which see above, p. 69). It is reprinted by V. Hasak (*Die Himmelstrasse oder die Evangelien des Jahres in Erklärungen für das christliche Volk nach d. deutschen Plenarien*, Regensburg, 1882, pp. 139-40) from *Spiegel menschlicher Behalt'nuz*, 1500, fol. lxx, "Ueber das Evangelium an Quinquagesimae, Lukas XVIII." The *Spiegel* is the German version of the *Speculum salvationis humanae*; but, since the Latin text is not accessible to me, I cannot say whether it is to be found there. Characteristic of this version is the commission of all the mortal sins. The text is as follows: Vnd das haben wir ein urkund an einen Einsiedel, dem ward ein Geteilttes gegeben, wellich todtsünd er wölte wählen. Da sprach er, er wolte lieber truncken werden, dann das er ein mord begieng, oder unkeuschheit thät. Und darnach do er truncken ward, do begieng er die todtsünden all mit einander, und auch ein mord. Und wie das käme, das findet man "in miraculis."